Appl. No. 09/812, 066 Amdt. Dated May 19, 2004

## **REMARKS:**

5

10

15

20

25

30

### REASONS THIS AMENDMENT SHOULD BE ENTERED

The Applicants submit that this amendment cancels rejected claims, complies with requirements set forth in the previous Office Action and otherwise puts the claims in allowable form. As such, entry of the amendment is proper under 37 CFR 1.113.

## **CLAIM AMENDMENTS**

To expedite prosecution, the Applicants have canceled claims 1-13, 42-47, 55, 58, 67-69, 76-77 and amended claims 14, 48, 66, and 70 to put them in independent form and overcome the Examiner's rejections under 35 USC 112. To further expedite prosecution, the Applicants have canceled withdrawn claims 101-117 without prejudice to the filing of a divisional application directed to these claims. In addition, the Applicants have amended claims 15, 21, and 32 to depend from claim 14, amended claims 56, 59, 61, and 65 to depend from claim 48, and amended claims 71, 74, 75, and 78 to depend from claim 70. Furthermore the Applicants have added new claims 118 and 119, which respectively depend from claims 66 and 70 and recite additional features therefore. The Applicants reserve the right to purse the canceled claims in a later-filed continuation or divisional application. Furthermore, the Applicants have corrected a minor typographical error in claim 16. The Applicants submit that these amendments merely make explicit that which was implicit in the claims as originally filed. Therefore, the Applicants submit no new matter is being entered with these amendments. Furthermore, the Applicants submit that these amendments do not narrow the scope of any limitation or element of any claim within the meaning of the decision in Festo Corp. v. Shoketsu Kogyo Kabushiki Co., Ltd., 234 F3d 558, 566, 56 U.S.P.Q.2d 1865 (Fed. Cir. 2000) 535 U.S. 722, 152 L. Ed. 2d 944, 122 S. Ct. 1831, (2002).

### **CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

The Examiner has objected to claims 70-72 and 77 for informalities. To expedite prosecution, the Applicants have rewritten claim 70 in independent form and amended claim 71 to depend from claim 70. In view of these amendments, the Applicants submit that claims 70-72 are no longer objectionable. Claim 77 has been canceled as set forth above and therefore the rejection of claim 77 is moot.

# **CLAIM REJECTIONS**

## 35 USC 112

5

10

15

20

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 10, 11, 45, 46, 76 and 77 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph for failing to comply with the enablement requirement. To expedite prosecution, the Applicants have canceled claims 10, 11, 45, 46, 76 and 77. Therefore, the rejections are most with respect to the canceled claims.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 1-100 under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. In rejecting the claims the Examiner states that in independent claims 1, 42 and 67 the limitation that there is interchangeable co-operation with one or more optical components renders the claims indefinite because the "optical component" is introduced as an element of the claim and its relationship with other structural components is indefinite. The Examiner also argues that the criteria for interchangeable cooperation are not clear.

The Applicants submit that the rejections are moot with respect to the canceled claims. The Applicants have rewritten claims 14, 48, 66, and 70 in independent form without the "interchangeable co-operation" feature that forms the basis of the Examiner's rejection. The Applicants submit that claims 15-41, 48-54, 56-57, 59-65, 71-100, 118 and 119 are allowable by virtue of their dependence. As such, the rejections are overcome.

The Examiner also states that claim 61 recites "a fold deflector optically coupled between the first and second", which renders the claim indefinite because it is not complete. In response, the Applicants submit that claim 61 was amended on August 25, 2003 to recite that the fold deflector is optically coupled between the "first and second <u>beam steering modules</u>." As such, the Examiner's rejection of claim 61 is moot since it had previously been addressed.

### 25 35 USC 102

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3,5-9, 12, 13, 21, 23-25, 32, 33, 42-44, 47, 65, 67, 69, 74, 75, 78, 79, 83, 84, and 90-94 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent 6,253,001 to Hoen. (hereinafter Hoen). The Applicant submits that the rejections of canceled claims 1-13, 42-47, 55, 58, 67-69, 76-77 are moot. The Applicants

submit that dependent claims 14, 48, 66 and 70 are allowable for the reasons cited by the Examiner. Furthermore, claims 15-41, 48-54, 56-57, 59-65, 71-100, 118 and 119 are allowable by virtue of their dependence on allowable claims.

# ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner has indicated that claims 14-20 22, 26-31, 34-41, 48-60, 61-64, 68, 70-73, 5 80-82, 85, 87, 98-91 and 95-100 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112 and to include the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. To Expedite prosecution, the Applicants have rewritten claims 14, 48, 66, and 70, in independent form as set forth above and overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112 as described above. In addition, new claims 118 and 119 respectively depend from claims 66 and 70 and include material formerly found in claim 68.

# CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, the Applicants submit that all pending claims are allowable over the cited art and define an invention suitable for patent protection. The Applicants further submit that, for the reasons set forth above, the pending claims are neither vague nor indefinite and that the claims are enabled. The Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner enter the amendment, reconsider the application and issue a Notice of Allowance in the next office action.

Respectfully submitted,

20

25

30

10

15

Joshua D. Isenberg Reg. No. 41,088 Patent Agent

JDI PATENT 204 Castro Lane Fremont, CA 94539 tel.: (510) 896-8328 fax.: (510) 360-9656 Date: May 19, 2004